



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/599,594	06/22/2000	Irina Nazarenko	IVGN 246	8750
65482	7590	08/29/2007	EXAMINER	
INVITROGEN CORPORATION			FREDMAN, JEFFREY NORMAN	
C/O INTELLEVATE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. BOX 52050			1637	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/29/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/599,594	NAZARENKO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffrey Fredman	1637	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 11,12,14,15,17-20,59,63-67,78 and 79 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 11,12,14,15,17-20,59 and 63-67 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 78-79 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1637

DETAILED ACTION***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 was filed in this application after appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, but prior to a decision on the appeal. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the appeal has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114 and prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on July 6, 2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Horn et al (U.S. Patent 6,465,175).

Horn teaches a method of claim 20 for quantification of target nucleic acid molecules in a sample comprising:

(a) Mixing one or more target nucleic acid molecules with one or more fluorescently labeled oligonucleotides (see column 3, lines 7-20),

Art Unit: 1637

Wherein said one or more oligonucleotides are labeled with only a single type of detectable label, said single type of detectable label having the same chemical structure (see column 3, lines 7-20, where only a single label is used)

And said one or more labels undergo a detectable change in an observable property upon said hybridizing (see column 3, lines 7-20, where the label is fluorescent when the probe is single stranded by is quenched when hybridized). In particular, Horn shows in example 1 at columns 13 and 14, that the BODIPY FL label was capable of being quenched by hybridization when it was directly linked to the probe, but not when it was linked via a linker which rendered it distant from the hybridization. In example 3 at columns 15 and 16 and in figure 1, Horn shows quenching with multiple labels with the same chemical structure, that of BODIPY FL. Horn makes the use of a single label explicit in example 5, where a modified Taqman assay is taught in which an oligonucleotide singly labeled with BODIPY FL is used without the use of a quencher dye (see column 17, lines 50-55).

(b) Incubating said mixture under conditions sufficient to synthesize one or more nucleic acid molecules complementary to a portion of said one or more target nucleic acid molecules (see columns 17 and 18)

(c) detecting the presence or absence or quantifying the amount of the target molecules by measuring the fluorescent label (see columns 17 and 18).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 11, 12, 14, 15, 17-20, 59 and 63-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horn et al (U.S. Patent 6,465,175) in view of Tyagi et al (U.S. Patent 6,037,130).

Horn teaches a method of claims 11 and 12 for quantification of target nucleic acid molecules in a sample comprising:

(a) Mixing one or more target nucleic acid molecules with one or more fluorescently labeled oligonucleotides (see column 3, lines 7-20),

Art Unit: 1637

Wherein said one or more oligonucleotides are labeled with only a single type of detectable label, said single type of detectable label having the same chemical structure (see column 3, lines 7-20, where only a single label is used)

And said one or more labels undergo a detectable change in an observable property upon said hybridizing (see column 3, lines 7-20, where the label is fluorescent when the probe is single stranded by is quenched when hybridized). In particular, Horn shows in example 1 at columns 13 and 14, that the BODIPY FL label was capable of being quenched by hybridization when it was directly linked to the probe, but not when it was linked via a linker which rendered it distant from the hybridization. In example 3 at columns 15 and 16 and in figure 1, Horn shows quenching with multiple labels with the same chemical structure, that of BODIPY FL. Horn makes the use of a single label explicit in example 5, where a modified Taqman assay is taught in which an oligonucleotide singly labeled with BODIPY FL is used without the use of a quencher dye (see column 17, lines 50-55).

(b) Incubating said mixture under conditions sufficient to synthesize one or more nucleic acid molecules complementary to a portion of said one or more target nucleic acid molecules (see columns 17 and 18)

(c) detecting the presence or absence or quantifying the amount of the target molecules by measuring the fluorescent label (see columns 17 and 18).

With regard to claims 14, 15, Horn teaches measurement of the fluorescence during PCR (see column 17, example 5), during LCR (see example 7, column 18) and during SDA (see example 9, column 19).

Art Unit: 1637

With regard to claims 17, 19, 59, Horn teaches the use of hairpin oligonucleotides (see figure 4, panel B, for example).

With regard to claim 18, Horn teaches application of the method to PCR (see column 2, line 55, for example).

With regard to claims 66, 67, Horn teaches placing the dye at the 3' termini (see column 13, line 39).

Horn expressly teaches application of the method to the use of hairpins and expressly references using Tyagi type molecular beacons with a single fluorescent bodipy label (see columns 17 and 18, example 6).

Horn does not teach incorporation of the hairpin primer into the PCR product and Horn does not teach each possible location of the internal base.

Tyagi teaches the use of hairpin primers (see column 18, example 5) and expressly teaches the use of fluorescently labeled molecular beacon primers being incorporated into the PCR product (see column 18, example 5).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the single label method of Horn with the hairpin primers of Tyagi since Horn notes "When used in nucleic acid amplification assays, gene detection is homogeneous and sensitive, and can be carried out in a sealed tube. See, Tyagi et al. (1996) Nature 14:303-308 (see column 18, lines 4-7)."

Art Unit: 1637

Further motivation to use the modify the Tyagi primers to use a single label is present when Horn notes "Accordingly, single label quenching molecular beacons can be used for the detection of nucleic acids in homogeneous assays and in living cells, as well as for real time monitoring of assays in which nucleic acids are being synthesized, e.g., polymerase chain reactions (see column 18, lines 43-47)." So an ordinary practitioner is motivated to substitute the single label quenching beacons of Horn in the method of Tyagi so that a separate quenching dye is not necessary (see column 18, line 32). Further, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adjust the exact positioning of the bases near the 3' end, since the particular distance from the 3' end is a matter of routine optimization in the absence of any secondary consideration. As noted in *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233 at 235,

More particularly, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation.

Routine optimization is not considered inventive and no evidence has been presented that the specific positioning of the labels was other than routine and was unexpected in any way.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 78-79 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 1637

8. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: In the absence of any evidence, the ordinary practitioner would expect that all fluorescent labels would function equally well in this assay. However, Horn specifically teaches that "Extensive quenching was observed with the BODIPY FL-labeled oligomer, in contrast to the fluorescein- and Texas Red-labeled oligomers which did not show an noticeable quenching under the same hybridization conditions (see column 14, lines 23-27)." In contrast, Applicant's specification expressly shows that each of the claimed labels, including fluorescein and rhodamine, function in the assay. Given direct experimental evidence demonstrated by Applicant, opposed by just a negative teaching of Horn that is not supported by data, the claims are found to be enabled. However, the negative teaching by Horn qualifies under MPEP 2145 as a direct teaching away from the use of these labels. Consequently, there is no case of *prima facie* obviousness due to the express teaching away of the Horn reference for use of fluorescein and Texas-red type labels, and no reasonable expectation that other labels would therefore function in the claimed assay. For these reasons, the indicated claims drawn to the specific labels, are objected to as discussed above.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed July 6, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The crux of the issue is whether there is motivation to modify the singly fluorescent labeled probes of Horn to function as primers in an amplification assay, as

Art Unit: 1637

Tyagi modified the older prior art doubly labeled probes to function as primers in an amplification assay.

Two specific motivations were identified in the rejection. The first motivation is based on the express statement of Horn. Horn notes "Accordingly, single label quenching molecular beacons can be used for the detection of nucleic acids in homogeneous assays and in living cells, as well as for real time monitoring of assays in which nucleic acids are being synthesized, e.g., polymerase chain reactions (see column 18, lines 43-47)." While Horn is referring to Taqman type assays in this quote, it is clear that Horn is contemplating the use of the single label molecular beacons in polymerase chain reactions.

A second and independent motivation derives from the teaching of Horn that his method is an improvement over the prior art (such as Tyagi) in that "This same design can be used without the need for a separate quenching dye (see column 18, lines 31-32)." This directly suggests to the ordinary practitioner, performing the extension method of Tyagi using the double labeled primer, that the single labeled primer of Horn will function. Motivations to use a single label results include Horn's statement that the singly labeled probes "nucleic acid hybridization assays having reduced background noise by, for example, producing a detectable signal only upon dissociation of a directly labeled probe from its complement are a significant improvement over conventional assay methods. (see column 10, lines 6-10)." An ordinary practitioner would be motivated to use singly labeled probes to reduce background noise as well as based

Art Unit: 1637

upon reduced cost since only a single label will need to be purchased and used in the oligonucleotide synthesis.

Applicant argues that Tyagi uses probes which are labeled with two fluorophores rather than one fluorophore and that this use of two fluorophores teaches away from the use of one fluorophore. To the contrary, Tyagi was unaware of the advance of Horn that a single fluorophore could be used in the place of two fluorophores (which occurred subsequent to Tyagi) and Tyagi simply teaches the basic method of amplification using the labeled oligonucleotide as a primer.

As the Federal Circuit noted in In re Fulton, 73 USPQ2d 1141, 1146 (Fed. Cir. 2004), "The prior art's mere disclosure of more than one alternative does not constitute a teaching away from any of these alternatives because such disclosure does not criticize, discredit, or otherwise discourage the solution claimed in the '198 application. Indeed, in the case cited by Applicants, In re Gurley, we held that the invention claimed in the patent application was unpatentable based primarily on a prior art reference that disclosed two alternatives, one of which was the claimed alternative. Accordingly, mere disclosure of alternative designs does not teach away." In the current case, the disclosure by Tyagi of an earlier design does not teach away from the improved design using a single label taught by Horn in the subsequent art.

Applicant then argues that the combination of the references would not yield the claimed invention. This argument is simply not correct because it fails to combine the references in the way that the ordinary artisan would be motivated to combine. The ordinary artisan would not modify the primer of Tyagi by removing a quenching dye, but

Art Unit: 1637

would rather substitute the entire primer of Horn for the primer of Tyagi. That is, in the amplification reaction of Tyagi, the ordinary practitioner would be motivated to use the new and improved single label oligonucleotide of Horn in the place of the doubly labeled oligonucleotide of Tyagi for the reasons given above.

In fact, Horn expressly teaches that the singly labeled probe would function as a replacement for the double labeled probe of Tyagi in example 6, where a different Tyagi method using double labeled probe is discussed and Horn indicates that the single labeled probe can be used in the place of Tyagi's double labeled probe.

Conclusion

10. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b).
Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 1637

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey Fredman whose telephone number is (571)272-0742. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on (571)272-0782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeffrey Fredman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1637

JF